DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 137 452 UD 016 810

AUTHOR Bloom, Irving
TITLE Bilingual Pupil Services; Summer, 1975.
INSTITUTION New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, N.Y. Office of Educational Evaluation.
PUB DATE 75
NOTE 30p.; New York City Board of Education Function No. 09-61621 ; Best copy available

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Bilingual Education; Bilingualism; *Bilingual Students; Language Handicaps; *Mathematics; Non English Speaking; Paraprofessional School Personnel; *Reading Programs; *School Services; *Spanish Speaking
IDENTIFIERS Bilingual Pupil Services Program; *Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I; *New York (New York)

ABSTRACT

This paper describes and evaluates the Bilingual Pupil Services Program in New York City. This program provided small group instructional services in reading and mathematics to students of Hispanic background whose regular teachers and bilingual coordinators identified them as requiring supplementary instruction because of language difficulties or other related educational handicaps. These services were provided to groups of about seven children to each bilingual professional assistant, educational assistant, or educational associate assigned to the classroom. The number of pupils served was approximately 410 at 19 sites in grades one through nine. The stress in the bilingual program was placed on language development skills and reading skills used to learn mathematical concepts and computations. The evaluation indicated that on the Cooper-McGuire criterion referenced tests which were used in most of the districts, the students at all age levels achieved 70% mastery of the identified reading objectives. Mathematics results are not reported since a standardized instrument in mathematics was not used. (Author/AM)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED137452

EVALUATION REPORT

Function No. 09-61621

Bilingual Pupil Services; Summer 1975

Irving Bloom, Ed. D.
Program Evaluator

UD016810

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

An evaluation of a New York City school district educational project funded under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (PL 89-10) performed under contract with the Board of Education of the City of New York for the summer of 1975.

2

DR. ANTHONY J. POLEMENI, DIRECTOR

BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK
OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL EVALUATION
110 LIVINGSTON STREET, BROOKLYN, N. Y. 11201

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Abstract	1
Part I	
Program Description	2
Part II	
Materials and Instruction	5
Reading, Language Development and ESL	6
Field Service Counselors	8
Part III	
Evaluation Results	10
Tables A - D	10
Appendices	
Test Key-Cooper McGuire	15
Pp. 30 Mir form and other related forms	16

Abstract

The Bilingual Pupil Services Program is a city-wide service which supports and supplements local community school instructional services for pupils who are of Hispanic backgrounds with limited English-speaking ability.

The summer of 1975 found forty-one bilingual professional assistants, five educational associates and fourteen educational assistants assigned in five school districts and nineteen schools to assist small groups of children (a ratio of seven to each professional or paraprofessional) in the areas of reading/language arts and mathematics. Each of the bilingual professionals or paraprofessionals worked under the supervision of a regular teacher and the total program was coordinated by five field service counselors, an assistant director and a director whose offices were at 66 Court Street.

The professional and paraprofessional titles are differentiated by the number of credits completed at the undergraduate level with the professional assistants having achieved a bachelor's degree plus twelve education credits in a program closely related to the bilingual education field at the City University. The other associates and assistants are still working towards a degree in a career ladder concept.

The response to the program in the districts was very positive as indicated in a majority of the interviews held with teachers and summer school principals. The need for help and the assistance given to children was highly praised by teachers and principals as well as dedication to their role.

In addition, the evaluation showed that on the Cooper-McGuire criterion reference tests which were used in most of the districts, the students had achieved 70% mastery of the identified objectives at all levels.

Part I

Program

I. Program Description

The primary objective of the Bilingual Pupil Services Program during the summer of 1975 (approximately six contact weeks) was to provide small group instructional services in reading and in mathematics for students of Hispanic background whose regular teachers and district bilingual coordinators identified them as requiring supplementary instruction because of language difficulties or other related educational handicaps. These educational services were provided in groups of approximately seven children to each bilingual professional assistant, educational assistant, or educational associate assigned to the classroom.

The differentiations between the above positions are basically ones of time and credits. The bilingual professional assistants (41) have bachelor's degrees plus twelve additional education credits towards a master's ; the educational associates (5) have at least 90 credits towards a degree; and the educational assistants (14) have a minimum of sixty credits towards a degree.

The professionals and paraprofessionals followed proposal guidelines in all cases observed (over 50%) and were instructing in math and reading in the major language (English or Spanish); each paraprofessional or professional serviced no more than seven children.

Although pre-testing was to identify the math and reading problems of the students, only reading problems were identified by the Cooper-McGuire Diagnostic Test. The special problems section deals with the testing situation in the program and explains some of the difficulties faced in the administration and in the instructional components of the program this summer.

Special circumstances related to the 1975 Summer Program

One week prior to the opening of schools for the summer session, the bilingual pupil services office was informed that those schools that originally agreed to function in the program had decided to reallocate their resources for the regular school year 1975-1976 rather than utilize funds for summer programs. This meant that in a short period of time the entire program had to be reorganized and assigned to alternate districts. This was accomplished and the opening of summer session found 410 pupils assigned to 19 schools in five districts.

In addition to organizational changes, the tests planned for pre and post testing in the program (Inter-American Series) were late in being delivered due to a strike in the building, 66 Court St.; the tests were returned to the airport and by the time they were returned to the offices of B.P.S. on Court St. too much time had elapsed for validation of results.

Although the administration of the program was faced with these circumstances students, professional and paraprofessional employees were assigned and placed swiftly and were functioning effectively when observations were made by the evaluator at the major sites (Districts 5 and 9).

Program Activities and Participants

Initially, the program began with two days of orientation meetings for the total staff at 66 Court Street, Brooklyn, where program goals and procedures were analyzed and discussed in a comprehensive manner. In addition, college related programming and personal problems were also taken into account so that there would be a smooth transition from central office orientation to in-district participation.

The original number of pupils to be served was 527 at nine sites for grades one through six. With revisions the final number of pupils served was 410 at 19 sites in grades one through nine.

Although the basic program was scheduled for Monday through Friday from 9:00-2:00 pm, there were some variations due to the changing of the original sites and earlier AM arrivals of the BPA's for additional volunteer duties such as breakfast programs. School administrators were favorably impressed with the willingness of the BPA's to participate in activities not directly related to their math and reading instruction, but to the general welfare of the children and to the success of the total summer school program.

Visits to over fifty per-cent of the sites during July indicated that appropriate placement and viable instruction was underway.

Liaison between districts, schools and central office was provided by the Field Service Counselors; this appeared to be effective and professional. This information is based on in-district interviews with summer school principals and the teachers to whom the BPA's were assigned. The on-site visits verified that pupils were being instructed in small groups (no larger than seven) in accordance with proposal guidelines. In most cases the pupils were instructed on a two period sequence, first in reading, then in mathematics or in a combination of the above skills depending on the needs of the individuals in the group. There was emphasis on utilizing standardized or teacher-made pre-test information in the design of student programs. Each BPA kept a log and profile sheet on which pupil information was recorded. There appeared to be good working relationships in each classroom visited. Cooperative planning and overall school coordination was evident. Principals were aware of the functions, purposes and limitations of program personnel and were very aware of their contribution to the classrooms in their buildings; the

high level of awareness was indicated by immediate recognition of the field service counselors by school administrative and teaching staff and their understanding of the guidelines as they applied to classroom instruction.

Materials and Instruction

There was a wide variation in the availability and use of materials at the program sites. In those cases where little or no instuctional materials were provided, BPA's developed their own remedial and instructional tools in English, English-as-a-Second-Language, Reading in English and Spanish and Mathematics in English and in Spanish. In other cases, however, the schools allowed both teachers and BPA's to utilize workbooks, readers and supplementary texts and all of the audio-visual materials available at the school. The differences in the availability of materials had to do with: (1)whether the summer school principal was associated with the school during the year, or (2) whether the principal was just temporarily assigned for summer session. It appeared that those instructors who had access to and knowledge of school resources were better able to "find" appropriate materials.

The following instruction was observed during the on-site observations in Mathematics:

In Mathematics at the elementary level (grades 1-6)

-addition facts
-subtraction facts
-multiplication facts
-division facts
-review of place value
-fractional parts
-use of manipulative materials for telling time
-addition, subtraction, multiplication using dollars and cents
-problem solving

Mathematics: Junior High and Ninth Grade (Primarily utilizing Ginn IMS Math System

-geomtry and geometric figures
-algebra
-graphs
-basic skills and operations
-measurements

Reading, Language Development and English-as-Second Language
All levels grades 1-9

Basic approaches in this area varied; they included oral language skills, reading in English and in Spanish, vocabulary development by utilizing workbooks, and teacher and teacher-aide made materials. The wide range of skills and diversity of student background should be noted for students were not only from Puerto Rican backgrounds, but also from Costa Rica, Ecuador, Colombia and Peru.

Most districts provided limited educational texts and materials and both teachers and aides were left to provide for additional materials for the individual students. Grouping based on instructional needs appeared to be the primary approach with teachers and BPA's dividing the groups accordingly, especially the latter who assisted students with language differences.

In most cases, teachers and aides were utilizing a combination of aide-made, teacher-made and commercial-made materials. Although students and teachers were busily engaged, some questions should be raised concerning the possibility of a degree of uniformity and organization of materials and tests that might be utilized in the future.

For example, if the Cooper-McGuire test is identified as the key pre-test to be utilized in the English-Vocabulary area, then a series of materials or resource file in kit form could be developed for teaching those skills which are identified as weak or lacking at particular levels. Although individual BPA's have made their own tests and devices for analysis and instruction, a cooperative sharing and development of particularly successful devices, kits, approaches and materials could be developed. The offices of the program director, assistant director and various other offices throughout the city are replete with materials and manuals which have been used in training sessions. Is it time to bring these tog ether for an analysis of what is available? Is there a need for a centralized or series of decentralized facilities where they can be found under the guidance and

supervision of teachers who have been successful in the field?

Although most activities were skill oriented, there were opportunities for aides to bring cultural enrichment and art into the program. Evidences of culturally related art work observed at several sites showed this attempt to correlate these areas.

Instructional Objectives in Reading and Mathematics

The objectives identified in the proposal regarding reading and mathematics state:

Instruction in Reading

The size of the instuctional groups will be compatible with the needs, level and abilities of the learners involved. Corrective reading groups of children mildly retarded in reading should not exceed 7 pupils and the remedial groups (severely retarded readers) should not exceed 4. The stress in the bilingual program will be in the language developement skills. Reading programs such as the Miami Linguistics, Laidlaw Reading Series, teacher-made materials in addition to the New York City curriculum guides in Language Arts K-8 have been suggested for use in the schools.

Instruction in Mathematics

Grade level grouping can be utilized within the classroom because of the wide range of language developement. Computational skills will be taught. The stress in the Bilingual Mathematics program will be in the specialized reading skills that apply to this subject area. Bilingual teacher-made and commercially-prepared materials are suggested for use in addition to the New York City Board of Education Curriculum Guides.

The above objectives in both areas were achieved and the BPA's followed guidelines very closely, as they did in all areas. Some recommenations will be made in the appropriate sections to deal with making the instruction even more individualized than this year's approach.

Role of the Field Service Counselors (5)

Key roles were played by the field service counselors who are mentioned in the preceeding pages. These counselors acted as liaison between the central office and the schools. It is this evaluator's analysis that the summer school principals were most aware of the BPA's and the project guidelines as a result of orientation by the counselors as well as the BPA's who served to reinforce the guidelines established. This approach appears to maintain central office contact most efficiently with a minimum of confusion. The BPA's, teachers and the school administrators accepted the role of the counselors so that day-to-day activities were supervised with minimal problems.

It is this evaluator's judgment, therefore, that the roles identified for the field service counselors in the project application (pp. 19-20) were implemented. If it were not for the continuing support supplied on-site and in the central office, the success of the administrative component would have been greatly diminished. It was also evident that Title I coordinators in the various districts were aware of the counselor's presence and her (his) coordinating function. A joint visit by this researcher and the counselor for District 9, Bronx, (where the greatest number of personnel were), pointed up the value of coordinating the program within each district. It also provided a degree of supervision and and control for the BPA's which was positive and effective since it offered on-site suggestions for enhancing teaching techniques, materials, small group organization and any immediate problems faced by the BPA's and paraprofessionals in the classrooms.

Visual checks of logs and pupil rosters were made by the Field Service Counselors. Corrections and suggestions were made to assist those working with children in keeping accurate records of their input.

Central Administrative Services

The Coordinator and Assistant Coordinator fuctioned in accordance with the proposal guidelines as indicated on pp. 23-24 of the origianl document. Each one functioned efficiently in their respective roles. For the coordinator and the assistant the basic initial crisis was the change of location of the project sites. This problem was quickly resolved and the researcher found(as previously stated) the BPA's and paraprofessionals quickly placed in alternative sites where their services were both wanted and lauded.

At the initial orientation meetings the administrators explained the program design and purposes directly and this writer found that the program was implemented in a professional manner. They accepted questions and suggestions from their staff in an open and democratic manner, but insisted that guidelines be followed in all instances.

During the summer when the research design required change, the administrators took part in the discussions and concurred with the rationale and approach. They participated fully in orienting their personnel to the changes and assisted in gathering the data with a minimum of disruption to the program.

In interviews with the director and her assistant, the researcher examined the procedure of interview, recruitment and evaluation of the staff and found that it too followed the guidelines developed in the proposal.

There also appeared to be a positive liaison with other agencies of the Board of Education with whom the administrators were involved.

Evaluation Objectives

1. To determine if as a result of participating in the program, 70% of the pupils master at least one instructional objective which prior to the program they did not master. The results indicate that this was achieved.

Extent to Which Results Were Achieved

The criterion referenced tests (both pre and post) from the Croft series were administered to 291 of the 410 pupils who received the program's instructional services. The data were taken from the Class Evaluation Records and the results are indicated in the tables which follow:

TABLE "A"

DISTRIBUTION OF PUPIL NON-MASTERY ON PRETEST AND NO POST-TEST FOLLOW-UP*

*This table does not apply for there were no pupils in this category.

TABLE "B"

DISTRIBUTION OF PUPIL MASTERY OF INSTRUCTIONAL OBJECTIVES PRIOR TO INSTRUCTION

Percentage of Mastery of Instructional Objectives	Number of Pupils	Percentage of Pupils
0-25%	291	100%

TABLE "C"

DISTRIBUTION OF PUPIL MASTERY BY INSTRUCTIONAL OBJECTIVE AS A RESULT OF INSTRUCTION

Instructional Objective	Ratio of #pupils achieving mastery / #pupils attempting mastery	% of mastery
1	279/291	95.9%

TABLE "D"

DISTRIBUTION OF THE NUMBER OF INSTRUCTIONAL OBJECTIVES MASTERED AFTER INSTRUCTION

Grade	No. of Objectives Mastered 0	1	*2	*3	*4	Number of Pupils	% of Pupils Passing One Objective
1	3	55	55	55	55	58	94.8%
2	1	40	40	40	40	41	97.6%
3	1	32	32	32	32	33	97.8%
4	2	37	37	37	37	39	94.9%
5	1	36	36	36	34	37	97.3%
6	3	30	29	28	27	33	90.9%
7	0	28	28	28	28	28	100.0%
8	1	21	19	19	19	22	95.5%

*Some students did not take test on all of the objectives because of absences, etc.

TABLE "E"

COVERED IN TABLE "D"

"Other Testing"

It should be noted, once again, that there were no standardized mathematics tests given, but teacher - made tests were utilized in the following schools:

P.S. 64	P.S. 114	J.H.S. 148
P.S. 70	P.S. 161	C.J.H.S. 117
P.S. 59	P.S. 155	C.E.S. 4
P.S. 120	P.S. 125	
P.S. 28	P.S. 90	

An analysis of teacher records related to mathematics instruction indicates that teachers did survey pupil needs. Math programs were developed around those needs. The concepts that were tested and taught are listed in a prior section. However, no valid results can be reported in this evaluation.

Evaluation Recommendation of the '74 Report, Implemented in '75

1. Handbooks and materials developed in the '74 program were distributed and used by the personnel in the '75 program. Sample programs were also observed in the director's office and were available to administrative and instructional staff.

2. Evaluation instruments were utilized on a class-by-class basis and for pre and post testing especially in the mathematics areas, results were kept in BPA logs. There was no evidence of "new" items added to the test pool for test items were often based on student need.

3. There were no criteria developed to assess central office efficiency. However, based on observed performance alone, during the initial weeks of the summer when schools, BPA's abd school districts required immediate reorganization and change, this researcher can say, without qualification, that there was great efficiency.

4. With regard to inflow of materials and ideas a "curriculum fair" was held and proved to be quite successful, however, additional work needs to be done in this area in terms of the "kits" recommended in this evaluation.

5. The program was regarded for the summer of 1975 and did meet its objectives.

Evaluation Objective #3

The final objective was to determine the extent to which the program as actually carried out, coincided with the program as described in the Project Proposal.

For the most part, the program as carried out coincided very closely with the proposal and its modifications. The only difficulties arose in the testing areas, which have been explained. Therefore, the only serious discrepancy was the lack of a standardized instrument in mathematics. The approved modification (Sept.10) indicated that there would be no mathematics results to report. Some teacher-made instruments and results were examined by the researcher and a reaction is contained in the body of this report.

Recommendations

1. A higher degree of certainty must be established for summer school placement of bilingual pupil personnel. Few, perhaps no program can function effectively if it is faced with a complete change in schools one week prior to implementation. The experience of the program's administrators avoided a complete halt in its implementation.

2. The development of an individual, basic testing and instructional survival kit is indicated. Each BPA found that he/she had to re-screen each student assigned in order to specifically identify strengths and weaknesses. A kit of materials is suggested for reading, language arts and mathematics.

3. Identifying a pre/post criterion referenced test in the vernacular of the students is required for

effective placement and diagnosis. These tests would:

a. screen for language dominance
b. test levels of function and specific disabilities or problems in the areas of reading, language arts and mathematics.

4. Assignments of a field counselor as on-site coordinator, part-time, with some instructional duties for the remainder of the day - one assigned to each site.

5. Centralized or a series of decentralized (in each district) instructional materials that can be called upon for summer schools. If necessary a "store" concept where the BPA's can "shop" for materials.

6. The program should be recycled for next summer in one or more of the following formats:

   a. pupil services component similar to this year
   b. preparation of curriculum survival kits
   c. test development component.

APPENDIX

STANDARDIZED TEST
COOPER McGUIRE
WORD-ANALYSIS
(CROFT SERIES)

KEY

	Objectives	# Items	0 Mastery	Showed Mastery
#2101 Gr. 1-3	1. Given groups of 4 letters, the learner will be able to select and mark the letter he hears dictated by the teacher with 80% accuracy. (R1)	26	20 - below	21 - above
#2102 Gr. 4-6	2. Given four pictures whose names begin with three different sounds, the learner will be able to mark the two beginning with the same sound as two dictated words with 80% accuracy. (R3)	15	11 - below	12 - above
#2105 Gr. 7-9	3. When the teacher says the separate sound elements of a word, the learner will be able to blend them and say the word with 80% accuracy. (R4)	10	7 - below	8 - above
	4. Given 4 choices, the learners will be able to mark the word that is the same as the first word with 80% accuracy. (R5)	20	15 - below	16 - above
	5. The learner will be able to recognize the consonant corresponding the sound he hears at the beginning of two dictated words with 100% accuracy. (P1)	21	20 - below	21 - above

The University of the State of New York
THE STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
Bureau of Urban and Community Programs Evaluation
Albany, New York 12234

MAILED INFORMATION REPORT FOR CATEGORICALLY AIDED EDUCATION PROJECTS

SECTION III

1974-75 School Year

Due Date: July 15, 1975

SED Project Number | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 8 | S | |

BE Function Number (N.Y.C. only) | 0 | 9 | 6 | 1 | 6 | 2 | 1 |

Project Title Bilingual Pupil Services

School District Name Central Board of Education

School District Address 66 Court Street

Brooklyn, N.Y. 11201

Name and Title of Person Completing this form:

Name Angela P. Bazley

Title Director

Telephone Number 212 522-7025
(Area Code)

Date this form was completed 10 / / 7

Use Table 26, for Historical Regression Design (6-step Formula) for Reading and Mathematics.

26. Standardized Test Results

In the Table below, enter the requested assessment information about the tests used to evaluate the effectiveness of major project component/activities in achieving desired objectives. This form requires means obtained from scores in the form of grade equivalent units as processed by the 6-step formula. (see District Evaluator's Handbook of Selected Evaluation Procedures, 1974, p. 29-31) Before completing this table, read all footnotes. Attach additional sheets if necessary. 25

Component Code	Activity Code	Test Used 1/	Form		Level		Total N 2/	Group ID 3/	Number Tested 4/	Pretest		Predicted Posttest Mean	Actual Posttest		Obtained Value of t	Sub-Group 5/
			Pre	Post	Pre	Post				Date	Mean		Date	Mean		

1/ Identify the test used and year of publication (MAT-58, CAT-70, etc.).
2/ Total number of participants in the activity.
3/ Identify the participants by specific grade level (e.g., grade 3, grade 5). Where several grades are combined, enter the last two digits of the component code.
4/ Total number of participants included in the pre and posttest calculations.
5/ Provide data for the following groups separately: Neglected (code as N), Delinquent (code as D), and Handicapped (code as H). Place the indicated code letter in the last column to signify the subgroup evaluated.

30. Criterion Referenced Test Results: In the table below, enter the requested information about criterion referenced test results used to evaluate the effectiveness of short treatments (less than 60 hours) in reading or mathematics. Use the instructional objective codes provided on pp.2-4 of the instruction manual. Provide only those instructional objective codes which were addressed by the treatment and provide separate data for each test used and each level tested. Use additional sheets if necessary. Record in columns 2, 3 and 4 only those participants who completed both tests.

Code	Instructional Objective	Publisher	Level	Component Code 1/	Subgroup 2/	Pretest No. of Pupils Passing (1)	Pretest No. of Pupils Failing (2)	Posttest No. of Pupils from Col. 2 Passing	Posttest No. of Pupils from Col. 2 Failing
2101	Letter Recog.	Cooper-McGuire	1	60813	B	0	58	55	3
2101	Letter Recog.	Cooper-McGuire	2	60813	B	0	41	40	1
2101	Letter Recog.	Cooper-McGuire	3	60813	B	0	33	32	1
2102	Initial/Med.Conson.	" "	4	60814	B	0	39	37	2
2102	Initial/Med.Conson.	" "	5	60814	B	0	37	36	1
2102	Initial/Med.Conson.	" "	6	60814	B	0	33	30	3
2105	Consonant Blends	Cooper-McGuire	7	60815	B	0	28	28	0
2105	Consonant Blends	Cooper-McGuire	8	60815	B	0	22	21	1

1/ Indicate the component code used in previous sections of this report used to describe treatment and population.
2/ Provide data for the following groups separately: Neglected (code as N), Delinquent (code as D), Bilingual code as B) and Handicapped (code as H). Place the indicated code letter in the last column to signify the subgroup evaluated.

Use Table 29 for districts with small number of eligible participants.

29. If the district funded a project in which the total number of pupils treated by the project summed to 30 or less, please use the following table. Do not identify each pupil by name; assign each pupil a number, and give complete test information on each pupil as indicated in the table. Before completing this form, read all footnotes. Attach additional sheets if necessary. 28

Pupil #	Component Code	Activity Code	Test Used 1/	Form		Level		Grade Level	Achievement Pretest		Achievement Posttest		Number of Contact Hours 2/	Screening Test 3/		
				Pre	Post	Pre	Post		Date	Standard Score	Date	Standard Score		Test Used	Date	Standard Score

1/ Identify test used and year of publication (MAT-58; CAT-70, etc).

2/ Enter the sum of the number of contact hours that this individual received supplementary services from this funding source.

3/ (Same as #1 above). The screening test is the test that was employed to establish eligibility during the needs assessment phase of the project.

*See notes on following pag

OFFICE OF EDUCACIONAL EVALUATION - DATA LOSS FORM
(attach to MIR, item #30) Function # 09-61621

-18-

In this table enter all Data Loss information. Between MIR, item #30 and this form, all participants in each activity must be accounted for. The component and activity codes used in completion of item #30 should be used here so that the two tables match. See definitions below table for further instructions.

Component Code	Activity Code	(1) Group I.D.	(2) Test Used	(3) Total N	(4) Number Tested/ Analyzed	(5) Participants Not Tested/ Analyzed N	%	Reasons why students were not tested, or if tested, were not analyzed	Number/ Reason
6 0 8 1 3	7 2 0	Gr. 1	C/McG	72	58	14	19	attrition (1) teacher-made assessment (13)	
6 0 8 1 3	7 2 0	Gr. 2	C/McG	50	41	9	18	attrition (6) teacher-made assessment (3)	
6 0 8 1 3	7 2 0	Gr. 3	C/McG	46	33	13	28	attrition (2) teacher-made assessment (11)	
6 0 8 1 4	7 2 0	Gr. 4	C/McG	54	39	15	28	attrition (1) teacher-made assessment (14)	
6 0 8 1 4	7 2 0	Gr. 5	C/McG	52	37	15	29	teacher-made assessment (15)	
6 0 8 1 4	7 2 0	Gr. 6	C/McG	50	33	17	34	teacher-made assessment (17)	
6 0 8 1 5	7 2 0	Gr. 7	C/McG	47	28	19	40	teacher-made assessment (19)	
6 0 8 1 5	7 2 0	Gr. 8	C/McG	39	22	17	44	teacher-made assessment (19)	

(1) Identify the participants by specific grade level (e.g., grade 3, grade 9). Where several grades are combined, enter the last two digits of the component code.
(2) Identify the test used and year of publication (MAT-70, SDAT-74, etc.).
(3) Number of participants in the activity.
(5) Number and percent of participants not tested and/or not analyzed on item #30.
(6) Specify all reasons why students were not tested and/or analyzed. For each reason specified, provide a separate number count. If any further documentation is available, please attach to this form. If further space is needed to specify and explain data loss, attach additional pages to this form.

26

* The following notations are an attempt to clarify the material on the data loss form. Although most of the students were tested with a standardized instrument (291 out of 410), the remainder could not, because we had to rely on the instrument used in local school districts due to program modification during the summer of 1975. Most of the explanation for the change is contained in an early section of this evaluation.

The so-called lost data, therfore, was never really lost, it was generated in a different manner and utilized teacher-made testing and other forms of assessment. The 109 students not tested with a standardized instrument fell into this category.

In following through on the modification, however, the data drawn from the pre and post tests of the 291 pupils indicates that 70% or more of the pupils receiving the program's services did achieve mastery of one objective initially failed in the pre-test. In fact, several objectives were mastered by the pupils in the final analysis. In addition it should be further noted that 71% of all of the pupils involved in the 1975 Summer Program were tested with the Cooper-McGuire test.

32. Program Abstract: Please provide an abstract of your project, including aspects of the project which account for highly positive results. Provide a summary of the findings in relation to the objectives, as well as a description of the pedagogical methodology employed.

33. Date activities began 7 / 1 / 75 (Mo. Day Yr.) Date activities will terminate 8 / 31 / 75 (Mo. Day Yr.)

34. Project time span (check one): 1[ ] School Year 2[X] Summer 3[ ] 12 Mos. 4[ ] More than 1 year

35. Project is: 1[ ] New 2[X] Resubmitted 3[ ] Continuation (Title III only)

A. If project is resubmitted, please indicate number of years operated:

[ ] 2 years [ ] 4 years

[ ] 3 years [X] 5 or more years

Measures of growth other than Standardized Tests

31. This question is designed to describe the attainment of approved objectives not normally associated with measurement by norm referenced standardized achievement tests. Such objectives usually deal with behavior that is indirectly observed, especially in the affective domain. For example, a reduction in truancy, a positive change in attitude toward learning, a reduction in disruptive behavior, an improved attitude toward self (as indicated by repeated interviews), etc., are frequently held to be prerequisite to the shift toward increased academic achievement by disadvantaged learners. Where your approved measurement devices do not lend themselves to reporting on tables 26, 27, 28, or 29, use any combination of items and report on separate pages. Attach additional pages if necessary.

Component Code [ ][ ][ ][ ][ ] Activity Code [ ][ ][ ] Objective Code [ ][ ][ ] [30]

Brief Description _____

_____

_____

_____

Number of cases observed: [ ][ ][ ][ ] Number of cases in treatment: [ ][ ][ ][ ]

Pretreatment index of behavior (Specify scale used): _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Criterion of success: _____

_____

Was objective fully met? Yes [ ] No [ ] If yes, by what criteria do you know? _____

_____

_____

Comments: _____

_____

_____